

IN THE HIGH COURT OF MADHYA PRADESH AT JABALPUR.

WRIT PETITION No. 976 /96

PETITIONERS : 1. Pramod Kumar Agrawal son of Shri Shankar Lal Agrawal, aged about 32 years, resident of 134-D, Ruanbandha Sector, Bhilai. Distt.Durg (M.P.)

2. Mahesh Gupta, son of R.D.Gupta, aged about 38 years, resident of Pushpak Nagar, Katul Board, Durg, Distt.Durg (M.P.)

-Versus-

RESPONDENTS : 1. Union of India through the Secretary, Ministry of Surface Transport, Government of India, New Delhi.

2. State of Madhya Pradesh through the Secretary, Ministry of Environment & Housing Vallabh Bhawan, Bhopal.

3. Union of India, through General Manager, South Eastern Railways, Garden Reech, Galcutta.

4. Special Area Development Authority, through its Chief Executive Officer, Special Area Development Authority, Bhilai-Durg Distt.Durg.

5. ~~Chairmanx~~ Special Area Development Authority, through its Chairman, Shri Laxman Chandrakar, Special Area Development Authority, Bhilai-Durg, Distt. Durg (M.P.)

Deleted vide Court Order dt. 7.12.98

Aff-eft-el 23-2-99

DRJ

PETITION UNDERARTICLES 226/227 OF CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

1. Particulars of the petitioners : As above.

2. Particulars of the respondents : As above.

Smt. Kamla Verma 91/3/96 Oath Commissioner JBP

..2

TWENTY RUPEES TWENTY TEN RUPEES

Amendment allowed vide order Dt. 7-12-98

J Chandhu

4. The Commissioner
Municipal Corporation, Bhilai
Distt. DURG

5. Shri Laxman Chandrakar
Ex.Chairman, Special Area Development Authority
Near Mohan Nagar P.S.Santrabadi,
Distt. DURG.

6. Chief Administrative Officer
National High Way Sub-Division
Lok Nirman Vibhag, Durg
Distt. DURG

(75)

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

मामला क्रमांक W.P. No. 976/96 सन् 200

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अंतिम आदेश
	01/11/2003 None for the petitioner. Shri Vinay Harit, Counsel for respondents 1 and 3. Earlier on two occasions i.e., 23-7-03 and 10-9-03 when the matter was taken up, Shri Shukla submitted that the Brief was taken away from him by the petitioner and the Counsel pleaded no instructions. This Court directed for issuance of a fixed date S.P.C/notice to the petitioner for his representation within 30 days from the date of receipt of the notice, failing which the petition shall be liable to be dismissed. Inspite of S.P.C/notice, even today when the matter is taken up, none appears for the petitioner. This petition is dismissed for non-prosecution. Sd/- Fakhruddin Judge Sd/- L.C.BHADOO Judge	

GRPRJ—FS/350—12/2000—50,000.

Roy